CLARIFYING THE NEWS

By Louise Harding

USA Adopts the Heinz Guderian Plan:

On July 9, 1951, this correspondent took note of an expose of this Plan, by Rep. Werdel, of California (Cong. Record pp. 3235, et seq.) Mr. Werdel said:

"I am reluctant to admit that I now believe that we have come to the awful day in America where we have a supreme general staff, modeled after Hitler and the Prussians, seeking military control over industry, labor, all military establishments, the economy, and the press. I am convinced that this is their plan against the expressed will of the Congress."

He was too optimistic about the Congress. A dispatch from Washington in the N.Y. Herald Tribune, June 30, 1953, said that an effort to stop the plan was beaten in the House, 234 to 108, although critics warned it was a major step toward military dictatorship.

The dispatch referred to the going into effect of "President Eisenhower's controversial plan for reorganizing the Defense Department. It gives the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff control over the joint staff, an organization of about 200 officers which prepares studies and plans from which the Joint Chiefs make their recommendations on strategy to the President."

Considering the belligerent attitude of Radford, the new chairman, toward China, the situation is seen to take a strong turn toward World War III.

Rep. Werdel said: "I hold here another paper purporting to be classified for security reasons. It is classified for internal, political reasons and not because its revelation gives military information to the enemy. It is General Marshall's proposal for a supreme staff for the United States." This was prepared in 1943.

In January 1947, James Forrestal, describing the nature and plan of the Marshall proposals, said: "They began really in 1942 when the Army drew up its ideas of how the military forces of this country would be best organized and administered. Those ideas, I think—I may be unjust about this remark—but I think they ran fundamentally against .....the spirit and genius of American institutions. They were based, and always have been, upon the concept of a single control of all military effort, that control nominally vested in a civilian, but in actual practice and result, really in the hands of one military Chief of Staff."

According to Forrestal's confidential memorandum, ".....the Army proposed that basic idea, and General Marshall was very candid in expressing it to me when I had a meeting with him...in the spring of 1945.....(Marshall) said that the Army faced the fact that the country wanted to disarm....."

It still wants to disarm; so Eisenhower pushes through this Plan. Just as, in West Germany, he connived with Adenauer to thwart the will of the German people, which American military intelligence reported was eighty per cent against rearming. Eisenhower demanded and obtained a promise from Adenauer that a plebiscite on the proposition be not allowed, and the movement was put down by force, by armed disruption of mass meetings for peace. This is what the militarists mean by democracy!

Irwin Edelman:

A story which concerns the First Amendment to the Constitution, without which Jefferson and Adams would not have approved the document:

On July 1, the following UP item was prominently displayed in the press:

> Pamphleteer Irwin Edelman, whose writings indirectly helped win a 24-hour stay of execution for Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, was convicted today, under a city ordinance, of failure to register as a vagrant. Attorney Dan C. Marshall, one of two lawyers influential in gaining the Rosenbergs their stay, pleaded in Municipal Court that Edelman was speaking on behalf of the atomic conspirators when arrested on vagrancy charges. Municipal Judge Gerald Kepple, however, said that was immaterial.
>
> Under the local ordinance, Edelman was required to register because of his conviction on a vagrancy charge in 1949. He appealed that conviction to the Supreme

Court but his plea was denied, although half his sentence was suspended after he served 46 days. ....Judge Kepple ordered Edelman to return for sentencing on July 6, but indicated he would grant a suspended sentence if Edelman registered within 48 hours.

It was Irwin Edelman's brilliant pamphlet, "Freedom's Electrocution", that got Attorneys Fyke Farmer and Daniel Marshall into the case. This might have won vindication for the Rosenbergs, since a delay and a re-trial would undoubtedly have shown up even more of the governmental skulduggery in the case which shocked public opinion throughout the world.

It will be remembered that, within recent days, a sub-committee of the United Nations condemned the vagrancy laws in sundry US states. Under this arrangement, a man who has not a job, and does not choose to take one at whatever the employer may choose to pay, may be hustled off to jail as a vagrant. In the Edelman case, his 1949 offense was speaking in a public park and selling literature. This was called vagrancy! The case was fought to the US Supreme Court, which dodged, telling Edelman he could start it all over again if he chose.

In the recent arrest, since Edelman commenced to fight the incompetency of Bloch, the attorney for the Rosenbergs, Edelman was arrested (same old charge), and put into a cell habitually reserved for sex offenders (though his jailers were careful to tell him no such charge had been placed against him). The news reporters, passing through and seeing this friend of justice confined in that particular cell, drew the inferences intended; and now, so Edelman writes your reporter, the press has contained "sly references" along that line!

Said former corporation lawyer, "Justice" Jackson, delivering the majority opinion which doomed the Rosenbergs:

"Edelman is a stranger to the Rosenbergs and to their case. His intervention was unauthorized by them and originally opposed by their counsel. What may be Edelman's purpose in getting himself into this litigation is not explained, although inquiry was made at the bar. It does not appear that his own record is entirely clear or that he would be a helpful or chosen champion. See Edelman v. California, 344 U.S. 357."

Yes, what could have been the motive of Edelman—and of all the others who worked without pay in this case, including Attorneys Fyke Farmer and Daniel Marshall? Why did Bourke Cochrane wear himself to death in the Tom Mooney case, also without pay? Such things must remain a mystery to persons of a certain type, who do not work without recompense.

Edelman's record is clear! He fought for freedom, and to sustain the First Amendment to the US Constitution, as well as to save two innocent persons from murder by the State. He has made a brave, able, and intelligent fight. He got no money—and a great deal of vile abuse—for protecting Justice.

Mr. "Justice" Jackson, highly-paid and supposed to act absolutely without prejudice, along with five of his colleagues, yielded to pressure and threats. Did they even act in accordance with law? If, in the United States, it is lawful to kill persons on perjury which has been plainly disclosed, then the Law is indeed, a miserable thing.

But, Jackson, from his safe position, berates and defames Edelman! Well, a toad, if placed in a sufficiently exalted place, can spit down venom on the wisest and kindest philosopher who passes underneath the toad's (or toady's) pedestal.

That Tungsten Reserve:

Charles Wells, in his "Between the Lines", says (May 1):

"Retention of our present positions in Korea is...vital to our defense program. 90 per cent of the tungsten reserves outside of China are located in the area now held by U.S. forces north of the 38th parallel."

A correspondent writing to San Francisco Chronicle remarks that there were reports in 1951 that the U.S. was importing tungsten mining equipment to Korea.

"Bring the good old bugle, boys, we'll sing another song.....while we are Fighting for Tungsten!"

TIME AND GREEK LOUIS

Remembering the Ludlow Massacre

To J.L.B.

If faith be cast away,
If love be laughed to scorn,
Then was that day doom's day
When I was born.

How shall I lift my feet?
Where shall I lay my head?
What shall my spirit wear,
With what be fed?

Time is the shape, they say,
That looms and fades away,
Of dust that wakes and cries
And knows itself and dies.

House of my father's faith,
Where is your cleaving spire?
Where is your comfort cool,
Your cleansing fire?

Greek Louis, standing straight
In Ludlow long ago
Under lead-hailing hate
Struck time down with love's blow!

He saw a laughing lass
Clutching her doll at play,
Lie silent in the grass;
He saw her mother sway,

He watched her mother keel
To her own last sleep;
Greek Louis would not kneel,
He could not weep.

Once only did he fall,
Sieved through with bullets' spray,
But a far Street, named Wall
Has fallen since that day.

Now through a little time,
Latching to his power,
We press in angry rhyme
His glory to this hour.

His grief a raging wave
Beating an ancient shore,
His grief on a tiny grave
Where no one grieved before,

Before and after time,
That shapes what is and was,
Standing inside the world
And the world's laws,

Moulded though he be,
Yet moulder too somehow,
Ploughed, yet his own two hands
Upon the plough.

If your mind would rob
What faith and love provide,
Burning with flames that throb
In the mind's pride,

Remember! What you know
Is made by what you do;
For you who live your love
His story, it is you!

Then is your love still fair,
Then is your faith not vain,
And you may truly share
His joy and pain.

So let the brush-fire breathe
Faith to your heart once more,
Let the untimed, untamed
Knock at your pride-prim door!

Greek Louis, standing straight
In Ludlow long ago,
Under lead-hailing hate
Struck time down with love's blow!

Time with its cruel gong
Of war that tramples song
Shall now hear evermore
The song that tramples war.

—K.L.

EDITORIAL

Rhee's United States:

The Leased Wire from the N.Y. Times had a dispatch by Robert Alden from Seoul (July 13), published in the Des Moines Register, about President Syngman Rhee and his talks with Walter S. Robertson, assistant secretary of state, bringing out that through al these negotiations the U.S. stood firm and Rhee yielded point after point.

Rhee violated the pledge of secrecy, which he had demanded in the first place, and leaked "news" which made it seem that it was the U.S. that yielded while he was the one who stood firm.

For instance he disclosed that he had agreed not to obstruct an armistice for a period of 90 days only, but that thereafter the U.S. had promised him freedom of action. It is true that he had demanded not only this but also the aid of the U.S. in the action he would take, namely, the re-opening of the war. No such promise, however, was given him by Robertson, said the dispatch.

But, and this is quite a but, it was agreed that if the Communists, by infiltration or other tactics, clearly violated the armistice agreement, then the U.S. would resume hostilities. Concerning Rhee's breach of faith the dispatch said, "Although vigorous protes were made to Rhee about the situation and he replied that something would be done, the leaks continued on the Korean side." Rhee broke his word repeatedly throughout the tal

Robertson was "infuriated" since "it could lead the Communists to believe that the UN command was not signing an armistice in good faith."

The question arises as to who is fooling whom. The U.S. put Rhee where he is and has supported his police state since the beginning. The U.S. can hardly pretend to be su prised if he keeps on doing what he was put there to do. Rhee cannot even be said to be faithless towards the U.S. As the New Republic observes, "it was under U.S. protection that Rhee's dictatorship was built."

One thing is certain today: Nobody trusts Rhee. And if the U.S. keeps up the farce of pretending that the Rhee regime is free and democratic it will not be long before nobody will trust the U.S. The question that keeps pressing on the conscience of the world is: why does the U.S., which holds the whip hand, allow Rhee to carry on as he does? O course we know that as a die-hard anti-Communist Rhee made himself convenient to the U.S. policy of "containment" as it applied to the Far East. But apparently it goes furthe than this. One feels in his actions towards the U.S. the contempt of an adventurer for a partner over whom he holds some power such as that of blackmail. One thing is sure: when the U.S. took a stake in Rhee they took a stake in immorality.

We have not the space here to deal again with all the questions having to do with the opening of Korean hostilities. Our views on those questions were published in the summer of 1950. But the very least we can say now is that many of these questions have never been satisfactorily answered by the U.S. or the UN. Rhee presumably could answer many of them, and quite possibly in such a way as to expose before the entire worl the up-to-now concealed story of U.S. (UN) involvement in one of the most punishing cam paigns ever to be visited upon an innocent people. And it is the nature of this campaign, rather than its diplomatic setting, which, the U.S. should be informed, has shocked mankind. It was hideously revealing when Dulles, in his post-armistice speech, boasted of the devastation.

A Grisly Outlook:

The sick fury of this so-called "police action" has made the question as to who started it pale into insignificance. As Reginald Thompson, who was on the scene, writes

"The original rights and wrongs in Korea are already submerged in a maze of bestiality and horror, unmatched I believe in all the human story." Thompson was a hardene war correspondent when he went to Korea. He says, "I had walked deep in death and destruction for years, but in Korea for the first time I knew at first hand the shame and utter horror of the indiscriminate massacre of the defenceless..."

But the pit appears to be bottomless. The newest expressed thought is atomic artillery. There are doubtless other thoughts not yet expressed. Furthermore, things are being set up in such a manner that in a possible new outbreak of war in the Far East the United States will be able to go it alone. Foregoing the moral protective coloration of the UN flag the U.S. will at the same time be able to get rid of the embarrassment of foreign troops who might be squeamish about what must be done to the non-coke-drinking portion of mankind. The outlook is grisly indeed.

One benefit, however, may accrue from this grimness. There can be little doubt that the elements which are pulling the U.S. towards catastrophe are growing more desperate every hour. Indeed the incredible antics of Syngman Rhee are a sign of this desperation. Taking only the latest instance, Rhee's "release" of POW's (driving them out of their compounds) was the final proof to the world outside the U.S. that the U.S. had been involved in a gigantic hoax. The perpetration of such a fraud places the U.S. in a position of moral subservience to its servant, Rhee. Furthermore, along with the conduct of the war itself it illuminates to the view of the people of the old empires certain characteristics of empire-builders which their foreign offices had always managed to conceal, characteristics of trickery and mean cruelty, double-dealing, dishonorable and cowardly methods of combat. The Korean war has already become a classic of imperialist debauchery.

But this very fact, when mankind attempts to digest it, may cause such a revulsion as will prevent its repetition. That an attempt will be made to repeat we cannot doubt. We can doubt that its perpetrators will succeed. It may pay Radford, Dulles, Knowland, and the rest, to think twice.

If, however, they should be able to drag the U.S. into a renewed attack on China through Formosa, if they get themselves directly (cutting out France) into large-scale intervention in South East Asia, and if at some point in the sequence of events they reopen the war on the Korean people, will not all this or any part of it wake the world up to the necessity of calling a halt to such adventures?

The newsreel at the movies shows great U.S. preparations on Formosa. The intention is openly proclaimed: war on China.

The U.S. is still in control of Japan, whose industries are geared to armament.

Dulles has cabled the native leaders in Viet Nam to come to Washington for direct consultation.

The stage is all set in Korea for reopening of hostilities. Once more the U.S. will take the honest upright Rhee's word that the treacherous reds have attacked in the night and must be repulsed. Only this time the U.S. will likely take sole responsibility for defending the "free" world.

Will the "free" world accept the situation? There are indications that it will not. This morning's (July 29) newscast (CBC) tells us that Britain is "feeling out" other powers on the proposal to admit China into the UN.

What if the U.S. should walk out on any such proposal? It is not unlikely that the time has come when the U.S. must be persuaded to modify at least some of its immediate objectives. This will not be easy. The crypto-clerical fascism (church-business alliance) which is at the moment guiding the destiny of the U.S., and which has tasted blood, will not easily be cheated of its bid, perhaps its final historic bid for world dominance.

Nevertheless the clearer the picture becomes the sooner will world sanity prevail. The picture is becoming devastatingly clear.

Protestant Leadership and the Congressional Inquisition:

There is a growing feeling of alarm in the U.S. about the various forms of control which are inexorably and swiftly moulding this land to the form of a military or police state. Many educational and church groups are giving voice to the alarm, which has taken as its focus the activities of Senator McCarthy. But there is one sad feature in all this "alarm".

Practically every resolution condemning so-called McCarthyism begins and ends by accepting his premise, that communism, however understood, is an unmitigated evil

and must be fought. The "alarm" too often turns into a bid to fight the "enemy" more effectively than Congressional committees fight it. So that the cleric or the educator finds himself on the same side of the fence with the committee and arguing with it simply on methods.

The trend toward clerical-fascism can never be stopped until it is realized that while we may and should argue methods with communists we should realize that communists are on our side in most aspects of the war against fascism, and that moreover the struggle to avoid all dictatorships, even that of the proletariat, can only be made in alliance with every force that increases democratic safeguards and diminishes arbitrary power. The only possible excuse for communist dictatorship is democratic failure in the tasks of economic adaptation to technological change. But in this continent democratic failure will issue first in fascist dictatorship and that is what the church-business alliance is trying to prepare the ground for.

A communist dictatorship can never issue from a freely functioning democracy. A freely functioning democracy can embrace all or any part of the positive communist program if it wishes to do so, while remaining thoroughly democratic. Democracy moves towards fascism, on the other hand, by yielding its constitutional prerogatives, one by one, under the hypnotic spell of fear-of-communism. And here's the important point: The road back to democracy from fascism must pass through communist dictatorship.

This is why our spiritual leaders are so wrong to play any part in developing on this continent the hate-communism hypnosis under which, if it continues, full-fledged fascism will be introduced.

For instance Bishop Oxnam recommends to the House Un-American Activities Committee that it allow persons listed in its files to review the materials and submit evidence in their own behalf. It is unlikely that his suggestion would be taken. The question is: should it have been given? It is difficult to see any common ground of discussion between a Methodist bishop and an inquisitor.

Bishop Oxnam is reported to have boasted that the Christian church was a more effective foe of communism than the Congressional committees. But if the Christian church were Christian, in the sense that St. Peter was a Christian, it could not be a foe of communism at all. It could, however, be such a champion of communism that there would never be the slightest need of dictatorship to bring it about. At the very least the church could champion the democratic right to choose as it wishes whichever economic system seems most adequate to control the presently dawning Alladin's Lamp technology in the interests of the human family.

As we said once before, to keep healthy, thus avoiding the doctor, doesn't mean to hate the doctor or to be anti-doctor. A healthy democracy, if it could live under capitalism, would stay capitalistic. But, if it should grow sick from a capitalism which is determined to cripple it, then it would certainly need a doctor. In other words, to join in the crippling process is to make certain that ultimately the toughest kind of bolshevism will be necessary to save the body politic.

The Outlook, organ of the National Council of Churches, is shocked that this same committee, stating (what is true) that Bishop Sherrill had been a sponsor of a Congress of Soviet-American Friendship, assumed that this meant a reprehensible pro-communist attitude. "But now note," says the Outlook, "the facts which the document...omits. The date of the sponsorship was 1942, when the USA and the USSR were allies in arms..." "Hundreds of other clergymen" were similarly treated, says the Outlook.

The time element, however, doesn't matter with the clerical-fascists. To have been friendly with Russia at any time is a sin. In fact, not to have been unfriendly is a sin against the "holy" hatred of communism. The date of the unproved crime of the Rosenbergs was as vital to their case as the date of Bishop Sherrill's sponsorship was to his. Yet the Outlook doesn't mention them in this connection although in their case their crucifixion was at stake. How far the church has departed from the Cross!

The Very Rev. James A. Pike, dean of the Cathedral in New York, said not long ago in a sermon, "The church has been in retreat in its social gospel—from fear of reprisals and from the confusion which has been engendered by the world communist threat.

Let the church rise to its responsibilities...and we will demonstrate that there is a healthy ferment that is by no means communistic and in fact is the best defense against communism, because it addresses itself to the conditions that breed communism."

We cite this because Dean Pike uses the customary phrase. Few sermons are preached without it: "the conditions that breed communism." In the first place communism is not bred by conditions. It is man's answer to conditions. In the second place it is not a condition of lack, of poverty, to which communism is an answer. It is a condition of plenty, of wealth. Technology has provided this condition: bursting granaries, rotting crops, rusting machines, not too little but too much. So much that more than half the wealth of the West is squandered on war machines some of which become obsolete soon after they are made, others being used to slaughter people who might consume the products of peaceful industry. Communism is man's answer to a constricted economy in which men march past warehouses full of goods they can't buy, to murder their brothers in some far country which has released its economy from this insanity, or to shoot down those who advocate a similar release of the domestic economy.

The Christian church, if it were independent of the economy of constriction, could comfort and encourage those who bring release. An act of humility is necessary before this can happen, humility before the act of the liberators. This act is primary. It is incarnation. It is baptism. The church should celebrate it, exalt it, present it to the author of life as a thank-offering, identify it as a new expression of the unity of the human family.

Dulles: A Bad Investment:

John Foster Dulles was a bad investment for the churches who let him lead them astray. He was a bad investment for Truman who let him plunge the U.S. into a unilateral war and turn the whole UN into what amounted to a shill for his con game. He is a bad investment for the Republicans, who are about to reap the harvest of his misdoing.

In our pamphlet "Common Sense About Korea" (1950) we called attention to Dulles' admission (N.Y. Times, July 30, 1950) that he had told the Rhee gang in South Korea that the U.S. welcomed them as allies in the U.S.-sponsored anti-Communist crusade. This was immediately after he had inspected the front-line trenches of Rhee's army.

Rhee had long been panting to over-run the North. He and his officials had openly proclaimed this. They were awaiting the go sign from the U.S.

Technically Rhee may have jumped the gun on the U.S., but this could not and cannot conceal the double-dealing of Dulles who in Korea openly assured the Rhee gang that they were not alone. What he promised them privately it is becoming less difficult to guess as each day passes. We can imagine his misgivings as he approaches the time when Rhee will confront him with these promises. He is planning to leave soon for a show-down with Rhee. It will be a murky day when these two melancholy heroes sit down together to settle the account of their sour adventure. Will Dulles try to palm off some more promises on the old man? Not perhaps couched in such lofty language as on the former occasion. Just a commitment of the U.S. to join a re-opened war, this time all stops open, no rules, no UN moral parasol, just naked atomic war. Perhaps he will be bold enough to make such promises. And Rhee may be desperate enough to believe that somehow they can be implemented.

Rhee will have Hobson's choice as to whether or not to carry on the partnership with Dulles. If he does, he will in all likelihood be double-crossed because the U.S. can hardly be committed to a second adventure so soon after such a monumental failure. If he doesn't, the home folks will pick him up with a pair of tongs and deposit him somewhere out of sight and memory.

It is thus that crime breeds crime, lie begets lie, until there is no road back to truth and decency.

The lie was so obvious in the beginning that we were astounded when certain of our supporters, men of presumable integrity, swallowed it and repudiated us when we pointed out that the U.S. had simply stuck a two-pronged fork into China: one prong through Formosa without apology or by-your-leave from anybody, and the other through Korea

in the guise of a "United Nations police-action". But it was one fork. And the power behind it was one power: the United States. The fact that the U.S. carried 95% of the UN burden in Korea is the factual revelation of the unilateral character of that incursion. Of course they carried 100% of the encirclement of Formosa.

But both prongs met a resistance altogether unexpected and bounced back. As if one should jab a hay fork into a granite rock. Therefore the summer of 1953 is quite different from the summer of 1950. There is no question any longer of the unification of Korea under Rhee. That question has been settled on the battlefield.

Rhee's present antics are those of an insane criminal who has nothing to lose by the most desperate escapades. But there is a consistency and a shrewdness in the insanity of Rhee. He has a large army. He has a quantity of U.S. supplies and ammunitio And above all he has the knowledge that much of the U.S. has whipped itself up into the identical insanity that possesses him. He knows that the premise of all political talk in the U.S., the premise of all political action, is his own premise: war to the death agains communism. He knows he has powerful friends at the highest levels of the American go ernment. He knows that whatever he may do to disrupt the truce will be interpreted in the U.S. press as Communist treachery. Already, since the armistice, "unidentified planes" have been reported shooting up Communists and then "flying South". Things of this sort have been happening all through the truce negotiations, whenever things looked good for a settlement.

Rhee may indulge in such a thought as this: After a peace has been signed it will b the easiest thing in the world to find some excuse to resume hostilities under new condi tions, preferably without the hampering auspices of the UN. And it is not fantastic to suppose that Dulles while publicly sentimentalizing for his UN audience might privately encourage such a thought. Remembering that the Korean peninsula is the historic road of invasion into China, it is interesting to hear that Knowland, the "Senator from Formo will accompany Dulles to Korea. Knowland is one of the apostles of war against China a can help Dulles bear the burden of any possible new commitments in that direction.

Some such perspective may be in the mind's eye view of important, perhaps decisiv sections of the American government and of big business, which at present openly controls that government. However, there are other sections which, while just as ambitiou have less to lose by being patient. These sections are represented by Walter Lippmann, the "liberal" of American imperialism.

Lippmann points out to the wild men of the American Century that the U.S. is simply not in a position at the present time to carry out all or even a good part of its threat to contain, roll-back, or liberate the Communist part of the world.

We quoted Lippmann's column (Aug. 11, 1950) in which, after stretching himself out of joint to defend Dulles with respect to the instigation of the Korean war, he threw his hands in the air when it came to defending the Formosan adventure. And then he called for the allies to get the U.S. off the hook. He said that Truman was too entangled in domestic politics to reverse himself in this matter. "But," he went on, "our allies are not so entangled as we are, and they could, acting within the framework of the United Nations, raise a new standard of hope and of peace to which the peoples of the world could rally."

These words were prophetic of what may happen now in 1953. It could have happened in 1950, given the slightest bit of backbone in the UN. It may happen today becaus the member nations of the UN, particularly the West Europeans, who would stand to lose most in a new general war, begin at last to glimpse catastrophe at the end of the road down which the U.S. has been leading them.

Lippmann is not defending Dulles today. In his column (July 31, 1953) he says:

"Mr. Dulles has promises outstanding to the UN, to Red China, to Formosa-China, to the North Koreans, to Dr. Rhee and to large elements in Congress." He goes on,

"It would be impossible for Mr. Dulles to honor all the promises. For they are often hopelessly contradictory, and some are positively weird. In the armistice agreement signed on Sunday we are committed 'to settle through negotiation the question of the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Korea,' and yet we appear to have promised

Dr. Rhee to make a treaty with him which stipulates that all American forces shall not be withdrawn from Korea.

"On unification we seem to have promised Dr. Rhee that we mean unification under his government. We shall not be able to honor such a promise...unification of Korea under Dr. Rhee's government is impossible. It is tantamount to saying that the Communists will surrender at the political conference what they were not made to surrender on the battlefield." He goes on further, and, since he speaks for a section of big money and big influence, we should listen carefully:

"Mr. Dulles is, moreover, on the horns of a dilemma in respect to Red China. To get the unified Korea, to which we are committed, we must negotiate an agreement with Red China. But while he is negotiating with Red China, Mr. Dulles must also maintain the position, not merely that we do not recognize Red China's right to the UN seat, but that we do not recognize the right of Red China to exist, and are morally and politically committed to its downfall.

"That does not make sense. You cannot expect to make political agreements with a government that you are committed to overthrow. And if you do make political agreements with such a government you have been pulling the leg of those who thought you were meaning to overthrow that government. Honesty would be in the end the better policy."

True, honesty would be better, or, if that is too much to expect, at least a more consistent pattern of lies.

The trouble is, the U.S. (dragging Canada along) is away off base, and Lippmann welcomes the idea of a United Nations discussion of the Korean settlement "in which Mr. Dulles's promises would be transcended, and the United States, to put it bluntly, gotten off the hook." It is to be hoped that the forces represented by Lippmann will soon come forth and make themselves felt. For this is exactly where we came in, in 1950. When a man of the conservative wisdom of Walter Lippmann pleads for the lesser fry to get the big fish off the hook, it would seem that the lesser fry should do something about it. And quickly, for time runs out.

Yes, indeed, from whatever angle you look at it, Dulles has been a bad investment.

* * * * * * * * *

TO ETHEL AND JULIUS ROSENBERG: JUNE 19,1953

Ten million voices raised, the mounting tread
Of marching feet, they would not hear. You died
Because they feared the things you stood for—Bread
for starving Spanish children; Peace (denied
While they must make the greatest profit); Will
Of Man to bring these things to pass; Freedom
To think and speak before all men. They kill
Your bodies, but to You they cannot come.
You took upon yourselves the common need
Of Brotherhood, as back to them you hurled
The hidden lie to justify their deed
Of bloody war. For love you gave the world
Your lives, and the sweet promise of your youth....
Arise, America! Proclaim this Truth!

—Nora Rodd

* * * * * * * * *

Snatches From Letters to the Editor

"...clear, courageous and correct as ever....rings the bell of forthright truth. —Matthew Weimar, N.Y. "Herewith check to aid your, for me, quite indispensable magazine...I have not lost interest in hearing the truth."—Kathryn R. Frey, Ill. "The March 1953 number is worth the entire subscription..."—Harry L. Diehl, Ill. "Please accept inadequate token of appreciation for your publication ONE."—David M. Fine, Wash. "...unequalled periodical"—Marion E. Perry, Cal.

ONE

(Formerly The Protestant)

AUGUST 1953

EDITOR
Kenneth Leslie

ASSOCIATE EDITOR
Rev. John Tunnicliffe

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

Archbishop Adam
Rev. William T. Baird
Rev. Russell C. Barbour
Rev. Reginald H. Bass
Rev. C. Harrison Becker
Bishop Albert Bereczky
Henrietta Buckmaster
Rev. R. Alex Cameron
Rev. Boise Dent
Bishop Laszlo Dezsery
Rev. I Jonathan Domas
Rev. H. deM. DuBois
Rev. Merlin W. Ennis
Rev. Stanley Evans
Rev. John Fekete
Rev. Joseph F. Fletcher
Rev. Erwin A. Gaede
Rev. Sidney E. Harris
Rev. A. Eustace Haydon
Rev. Daniel Hughes
Rev. Hewlett Johnson
Rev. E. O. Joynes
Rev. Imre Kadar
Rev. Mercer Wilson
Rev. J. Spencer Kennard, Jr
Rev. Ferenc H. Kiss
John A. Lee
David Lord
Rev. Donald Lothrop
Rev. E. D. McGowan
Prof. John Macmurray
Rev. John A. Maynard
Rev. Laszlo Michnay
Rev. Joseph G. Moore
Rev. J. Murdock Palmer
Bishop John Peter
Rev. Dryden L. Phelps
Ida Pruit
Rev. D. McKeen Reid
Leslie Roberts
Raymond Robins
Rev. R. Ross-Shannon
Watson Thomson
Bishop Lajos Veto
Rev. Wilfred Wakefield
Rev. Etienne Watts
Prof. Henry N. Wieman
Rev. Claude Williams

ONE is published monthly by New Christian Books, 69 Inglis Street, Halifax, Nova Scotia. By subscription only. 12 issues $3.25. Checks and money orders payable to **New Christian Books. No agents.**

ONE

He hath made of one blood
All Nations

AUGUST 1953 Edited by Kenneth Leslie

OLD 124th

Turn back, O Man, forswear thy foolish ways,
Old now is Earth, and none may count her days;
Yet thou, her child, whose head is crown'd with flame,
Still wilt not hear thine inner God proclaim—
'Turn back, O Man, forswear thy foolish ways.'

Earth might be fair and all men glad and wise,
Age after age their tragic empires rise,
Built while they dream, and in that dreaming weep;
Would Man but wake from out his haunted sleep,
Earth might be fair and all men glad and wise.

Earth shall be fair and all her people one;
Nor till that hour shall God's whole will be done.
Now, even now, once more from earth to sky,
Peals forth in joy Man's old undaunted cry—
'Earth shall be fair and all her folk be One!'

CLIFFORD BAX

(Adapted from Genevan Psalter 1551)

U. S. ADOPTS GUDERIAN PLAN

By Louise Harding

DULLES: BAD INVESTMENT

Vol. IX No. 10 30 cents